

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the Application. Claims 21-24 have been added. Claims 1, 5, 11-13 and 15-17 have been amended.

### Drawings

The drawings were objected to for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

An amended drawing figure has been submitted with this response.

### Claim Objections

The Patent Office objected to claims 9-12 for informalities.

Claims 9-12 have been amended to correct the informalities.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-3, 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,633,630 by Owens et al., ("Owens").

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Patent Office rejected claims 4-7, 9-12 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,630 by Owens et al., ("Owens") in view of U.S. Patent 6,523,040 by Lo et al., ("Lo").

Applicant respectfully traverses both rejections. Applicant respectfully submits independent claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 include novel and nonobvious elements. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Further, "anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542,

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. In Figure 1, omitted elements 9, 23 and 27 have been added; no new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Emphasis added. Additionally, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Ryoka*, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). See also *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 include elements which have not been disclosed by Owens or Lo, individually or in combination. For example, claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 recite organizing content of a message into a template, said template including information fields selected by a user and a number of characters for each field selected by said user, wherein said message is available for access in accordance with said template for said user. The ability to select a template including information fields and number of characters for each field is advantageous for the user since information is presented to the user in the precise form and detail desired by the user. This ability is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Owens or Lo, individually or in combination. In fact, Owens and Lo fail to mention organizing content of a message into a template, said template including information fields selected by a user and a number of characters for each field selected by said user, wherein said message is available for access in accordance with said template for said user. Consequently, elements of claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 have not been taught by Owens or Lo, individually or in combination. Thus, claims 1-24 should be allowed.


### Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable, and it is respectfully requested that the entire application now be passed to formal allowance.

Date: 17 Jan. 05

Respectfully requested,

By:



David D. Chung  
Registration No. 38,409  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel: 650-694-5339  
Fax: 650-968-4517

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Customer Number: 28524  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department  
Telephone: (732) 321-3026